

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHNO #0009 0071543
ZNY CCCCC ZZH
O 071543Z JAN 08
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1540
INFO RUEHZG/NATO EU COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE
RUEHBUL/AMEMBASSY KABUL IMMEDIATE 0798
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK IMMEDIATE 0550

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 000009

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 01/07/2018
TAGS: [IO](#) [PREL](#) [NATO](#) [AF](#)
SUBJECT: UN AND NATO SECGENS DISCUSS AFGHANISTAN SENIOR
CIVILIAN REP

REF: SECSTATE 1001

Classified By: CHARGE RICHARD OLSON FOR REASONS 1.4(B) AND (D).

¶1. (C) Ambassador delivered reftel demarche orally to NATO SYG on January 4. Charge delivered Terms of Reference on January 7.

¶2. (C) Separately, UNSYG Ban Ki Moon telephoned NATO SYG Jaap de Hoop Scheffer on January 4 to discuss the proposed Terms of Reference for the Senior International Civilian Representative to Afghanistan (reftel), according to de Hoop Scheffer's office. Ban said that double- or triple-hatting the Representative with NATO and/or EU responsibilities, in addition to the UN hat, is now off the table, but there is a good chance of a coordinating role. Ban said he would pass the (UN blessed version) of the Terms of Reference to de Hoop Scheffer, which will allow the latter to discuss it with NATO PermReps, ideally on January 8.

¶3. (C) Ban urged that NATO and the UN conclude a "non-binding agreement," probably in the form of an exchange of letters, on cooperation between ISAF and the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA). (Note: this idea was originally raised with NATO interlocutors by UN USG for Safety and Security David Veness (UK) in March 2007. Veness then followed up with a letter to NATO with a proposed draft of an ISAF-UNAMA "Letter of Arrangement," but the idea was coolly received at NATO for two reasons: first, NATO was anticipating a broader NATO-UN declaration would preclude the need for a separate ISAF-UNAMA agreement; and second, NATO's inability to reach a similar agreement between ISAF and EUPOL --because of Turkey's unwillingness to agree-- suggested that progress would not be easy.) In the phone call, Ban told de Hoop Scheffer he hoped to have the broad NATO-UN declaration completed by Bucharest.

¶4. (C) Comment: Given that Ban has now raised the dormant issue of a separate ISAF-UNAMA agreement personally with de Hoop Scheffer, NATO owes Ban a reply. With discussions on the NATO-UN declaration ongoing, we are not convinced a separate, parallel ISAF-UNAMA Agreement is the most effective way forward. However, we do not oppose discussion of such an agreement on the margins, as long as it does not impede progress on nominating the Senior International Civilian Representative or slow the discussions on the broader NATO-UN declaration. Mission requests Washington guidance by OOB Brussels-time January 8, on points we can make with SYG de Hoop Scheffer and the NATO PermReps.
OLSON